

United States Patent and Trademark Office

APPLICATION NO	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO	CONFIRMATION NO	
09 847,892	05/02/2001	Joseph F. Walsh	35006-00019CIP 7516		
75	90 02 28 2002				
SUMMIT LAW GROUP			EXAMINER		
1505 Westlake Ave., North Seattle, WA 98019			LE, THIE	LE, THIEN MINH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2876		

DATE MAILED: 02-28-2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.		Applicant(s)	M			
•		09/847,892		BOYDSTON ET AL.	1			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit				
		Thien M. Le		2876				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cove	r sheet with the c	orrespondence addr	ess			
THE - External after of the control	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period voice to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing end patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, how y within the statutory minuit apply and will expire , cause the application t	ever, may a reply be tim nimum of thirty (30) days SIX (6) MONTHS from o become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this comr D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.			
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on							
2a)□	•	— · is action is non-f	inal					
3)								
٧,١	closed in accordance with the practice under							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
4) 🖂	Claim(s) 1-86 is/are pending in the application	1.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	wn from consider	ation.					
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-86</u> is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)[]	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election require	ment.					
Applicat	ion Papers							
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accep	oted or b) 🗌 object	ed to by the Exar	niner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be he	d in abeyance. Se	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	_is: a)∐ approve	ed b)⊡ disappro	ved by the Examiner.				
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep	oly to this Office ac	tion.					
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.						
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 3	5 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).				
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been rece	eived.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been rece	ived in Application	on No				
* 5	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International But See the attached detailed Office action for a list	reau (PCT Rule	17.2(a)).		age			
14) 🗌 A	acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	c priority under 3	5 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional a	oplication).			
) The translation of the foreign language pro Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti							
Attachmen	t(s)							
2) 🔲 Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO 948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5)		(PTO-413) Paper No(s). Patent Application (PTO-1				

Art Unit: 2876

DETAILED ACTION

The formal drawings filed on 12/31/2001 have been received. Claims 1-86 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Knowles et al. (hereinafter Knowles – 5,869,819) or under 102(b) by Wellner (5,640,193).

Knowles discloses a hand-held optical reader comprising a keypad, a scanning module for reading URL encoded bar codes. The system includes the step of decoding the bar codes, retrieving data relating to the URLs through a network and outputting the

Art Unit: 2876

retrieved information to a computer. Similarly, Wellner discloses a handheld terminal for reading the retrieving information through a subscriber's network. Wellner also discloses the use of URL encoded bar code. As can be seen, Knowles and Wellner disclose the claimed invention.

Claims 2-6, 19, 20, 22-24, 26-27, 30-33, 35, 58-60, 64-68, 73, 75-77, 79-83, 85-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Knowles et al. (hereinafter Knowles – 5,869,819).

Regarding claims 2-4, see the discussions regarding claim 1. Knowles shows a bar code scanner having a keyboard.

Regarding claim 5-6, Knowles discloses the use of URL encoded bar code which would meet all limitations set forth in these claims.

As to claims 19, 20, 22-24, 26-27, 30-33, 35, 58-60, 64-68, 73, 75-77, 79-83, and 85-86, see the discussions set forth above. Specifically, Knowles discloses a handheld laser scanner comprising CCD array, the serial input/output ports, etc. as recited in the claims.

Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wellner (5,640,193).

Wellner discloses a system for downloading programs from a subscriber network which includes the use of an access code.

Art Unit: 2876

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 8-18, 21, 25, 28-29, 34, 36-57, 61-63, 69-72, 74, 78, and 84, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious by Knowles et al. (hereinafter Knowles – 5,869,819).

Regarding claims 8-18, 21, 25, 28-29, 34, 36-57, 61-63, 69-72, 74, 78, and 84, the system as taught by Knowles has been discussed above. The claims differ in calling for various variations and combinations including: memory, card reader, low-power proximity detector, magnetic card, audio input/output ports, etc. It would have

Art Unit: 2876

been obvious to incorporate these features in the system as taught by Knowles. The use of each and some combinations of these features in bar code scanning system are known and have been incorporated in commercially available scanners. Fro example, the use of proximity detector has long been used and developed by many scanner manufacturers, including: Symbol Technologies; Spectra Physics Corp.; Norand; Metrologics; etc. Further, magnetic card reader and audio input/output ports have been incorporated in self-checkout and POS environments. Without any unexpected result, the modifications are merely considerations which are well within skill levels and expectations of an ordinary skilled artisan.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thien M. Le whose telephone number is (703) 305-350. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:30am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-5841 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Application/Control Number: 09/847,892 Art Unit: 2876

Le, Thien M. Primary Examiner Art Unit 2876 February 14, 2002